



Docket No.: 251239US3CONT

OBLON
SPIVAK
MCCLELIAND
MAIER
&
NEUSTADT
P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/815,850

Applicants: Hirotoshi TAWARA, et al.

Filing Date: April 2, 2004 For: CLEANING DEVICE

Group Art Unit: 1744

Examiner: SPISICH, MARK

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

J. Derek Mason, Ph.D.

Registration No. 35,270

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone) (703) 413-2220 (fax) Katherine P. Barecchia Registration No. 50,607

1:\ATTY\KDP\25's\251239US\251239US RESTRICTION RESPONSE CVR 8.31.05.DOC



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF

•

: EXAMINER: SPISICH, MARK

HIROTOSHI TAWARA, ET AL.

SERIAL NO: 10/815,850

FILED: APRIL 2, 2004

: GROUP ART UNIT: 1744

FOR: CLEANING DEVICE

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated August 1, 2005, Applicants provisionally elect with traverse Group VIII, and identify Claims 14-22 as readable on the elected group.

Applicants traverse the outstanding Restriction Requirement because, as set forth in MPEP § 803: "If the search examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions."

The claims of Groups I-VIII appear to be part of an overlapping search area.

Therefore, Applicants traverse the outstanding Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a serious burden on the Examiner.

Application No. 10/815,850 Reply to Restriction Requirement dated August 1, 2005

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single group be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1-22 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Customer Number} \\ 22850 \end{array}$

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04) J. Derek Mason, Ph.D. Attorney of Record Registration No. 35,270

Katherine P. Barecchia Registration No. 50,607

I:\ATTY\KDP\25'\$\251239U\$\251239U\$ RESTRICTION RESPONSE 8.31.05.DOC